UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/537,704 | 12/12/2005 | Richard James Lewis | 16095 | 6539 |
| | 7590 12/30/200 FT MURPHY & PRES | EXAMINER | | |
| 400 GARDEN | | AUDET, MAURY A | | |
| SUITE 300 GARDEN CITY, NY 11530 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1654 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 12/30/2009 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|-----------------|--------------|--|--|
| 10/537,704 | LEWIS ET AL. | | |
| | | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | |

| | MAURY AUDET | 1654 | |
|--|--|---|---|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet w | vith the correspondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED 30 October 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A | PPLICATION IN CONDIT | TON FOR ALLOWANCE. | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods: | replies: (1) an amendment eal (with appeal fee) in cor | t, affidavit, or other evidence, v npliance with 37 CFR 41.31; o | which places the r (3) a Request |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f) | dvisory Action, or (2) the date ater than SIX MONTHS from b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) W | the mailing date of the final rejection | on. |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | ension and the corresponding hortened statutory period for than three months after the n | g amount of the fee. The appropri- reply originally set in the final Offic | ate extension fee be action; or (2) as |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.3 | 37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be a considered after a final rejection and a considere | nsideration and/or search w); ter form for appeal by mat | (see NOTE below); erially reducing or simplifying t | |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 | · • | | PTOL-324). |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) 15 and 16 would be the non-allowable claim(s). | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: 15 and 16. Claim(s) objected to: 4 and 5. Claim(s) rejected: 1-3,6 and 7. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 11 and 17-21. | | b) | xplanation of |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections und | ler appeal and/or appellant fail | s to provide a |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but | | · | |
| | . Goes NOT place the app | noadon in condition for allowan | oo because. |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other: <u>See continuation below</u>. | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). | | |
| | /Maury Audet/ | | |
| | Examiner, Art U Full Sign. Auth. l | | |

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Application No.

Continuation of 4(e) Other:

I. First Ground: Applicant has changed the scope of the claims by amending Claim 4 to include to new species SEQ ID NO: 7 and 8, which were not pending at the time of the Final Rejection, or searched/examined as to being free of the art (even if the genus was, as Applicant has indicated; these nevertheless have to be individually searched/examined and determined allowable). Applicant asserts that SEQ ID NO: 7-8 were inadvertently deleted from the claims. Even if inadvertent, this changed the scope of the claims and the search/examination thereof. Which is clear on the record in the Final Rejection, where the Examiner accommodated Applicant's request for rejoinder of certain SEQ ID NOS:, none of which were SEQ ID NOS: 7-8:

"Restriction Election and Traversal Acknowledged:

The FINAL restriction requirement is maintained as provided previously, as to the methods, BUT, the peptides have been rejoined. Specifically, Applicant's request for the rejoinder of the remaining, amended five (5) SEQ ID NOS: 5-6, 9, and 10-11, as well as the amended genus peptide formula of claim 1 is EXTENDED. Claim 5, product, is hereby rejoined.

The method claims will be rejoined under In re Ochiai upon the Allowability of the product claims to which they depend.

Thereafter, upon allowability of any method claims formerly within a different group, the FINALITY of the restriction requirement as to these will be VACATED."

II. Second Grounds: SEQ ID NOS: 7-8 are amended into claim 4, which still has an outstanding Objection as depending from Obviousness Double Patenting Rejected base Claim 1 over SN '088's overlapping SEQ ID NO: 5; which Applicant acknowledges is now issued Patent US 7507717 B2. Thus making the Double Patenting Rejection no longer merely Provisional, since that application has Issued.

As Applicant indicated in his Summary of the Interview filed 11/19/09, 20 days after the After Final Amendment:

"The undersigned attorney also indicated to the Examiner that Applicants intended to file a terminal disclaimer to address the obviousness type double patenting rejection."

For reasons the Examiner is uncertain, Applicant has not filed this Terminal Disclaimer. Like the first ground above, SEQ ID NOS: 7-8 have not been searched/examined to determine if there are claimed species or obvious genus, that overlap in the now '717 B2 Patent, with SEQ ID NOS: 7-8.

Thus, the Double Patenting Rejection, the only rejection of record, remains outstanding (no longer just a provisional, per Applicant's notice the application has Issued).

[The 35 USC 112 2nd Rejection also remains outstanding since the Claim Amendments cannot be entered for the reasons stated. But it is noted the amendments made would overcome the 112 2nd rejection, at such time as these amendments become part of the record.].

- III. Should Applicant not accept the allowance of claims 15-16 per claimset filed 12/19/08, still of record noted above (Allowed in Final Rejection), Applicant may wish to consider the filing of RCE in order to have all the amended claims considered, including those drawn to SEQ ID NOS: 7-8, and to file the Terminal Disclaimer.
- IV. It is noted that the (Withdrawn) claims, drawn to Methods of Use, may be subject to 35 USC 112 1st Enablement issues, should Applicant seek rejoinder thereof under In re Ochiai, once the claims are amended to an Allowable Product.
- V. Status of Other Claim Amendments:

Additionally, though Form-324 is not sent herewith, as definitively raising status-type amendments that are non-compliant; Applicant is is asked to delete (not just line through) the subject matter of (Cancelled) claims 20-21 and identify Claim 22 as (Withdrawn-New), to put the amendments in proper form. See below.

1. Claims 11, 20-21 are (Cancelled) and must have the text deleted therefrom; like Applicant did in (Cancelled) claims 8-10 and 12-14.

See MPEP 714. C. Status Identifiers:

"A claim being canceled must be indicated as "canceled;" the text of the claim must not be presented. Providing an instruction to cancel is optional. Canceled and not entered claims must be listed by only the claim number and status identifier, without presenting the text of the claims."

2. Claim 22 is identified as (New). Claim 22 both depends from and depends to a Withdrawn claim. Thus, it is a (Withdrawn-New), and should be identified thereas,

- i) MPEP 714 C. (E) Status Identifier (Withdrawn-New); &

ii) See MPEP 714 C. Status Identifiers (A): "For any amendment being filed in response to a restriction or election of species requirement and any subsequent amendment, any claims which are non-elected must have the status identifier (withdrawn)."

[Specifically, Claim 22 depends from (Withdrawn-Currently Amended) Claim 18 and depends to (Withdrawn-Currently Amended) Claim 17.]